

## THE TELEGRAPH.

AUGUST 4.

For the Telegraph.  
TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.  
AN EXPLANATION.

The undersigned regards it a duty which he owes the community and himself, to state that the "Few Remarks on Communion," at the close of his "Sermon on Baptism," are neither the production of his pen, nor contain his real sentiments. The essential facts which relate to the subject are these: A committee was appointed to publish that sermon, or such parts of it as they should regard expedient to subvert the cause of truth. That committee finally concluded to publish the sermon entire. As it was not convenient for me exclusively to superintend the publication, being at some distance from the press, Rev. Mr. Haff, one of the above committee, and who was then a resident at Middlebury, was selected as an assistant. During my absence, and on his own responsibility, that brother wrote and published the remarks referred to. In making this statement it is not my intention to attach any blame to Mr. Haff. I simply wish to state the facts as they occurred. As he fully understood my views of communion, I have never supposed that he designed to make the impression on the public mind that these remarks contained my sentiments, or that I was in any respect responsible for them. It must however be admitted, from the place which these remarks occupy at the close of the sermon, that such an impression was very likely to be made; and it is to be regretted that they were not accompanied with his own signature, as this would have effectually precluded all possibility of mistake.

I say once for all, to all whom it concerns, that every thing I have published on this very sensitive subject—the subject of communion—is found in a single remark in the preface to that sermon. That remark was penned with great caution, and with a determination, at the time, not to commit myself on the side of restricted communion. And I am persuaded that no man of intelligence and candor will regard it a commitment, but will construe it with the most liberal and enlightened view of the subject.

With sentiments of sincere respect,  
E. HALPING.  
Brandon, July, 1836.

P. S.—The design of this communication will be fully understood by the following:

TO THE ADDISON COUNTY BAPTIST  
MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE.

## Beloved Brethren:

You will recollect that when I presented myself before you, at the first, for the purpose of asking your counsel, and also of uniting with you in Christian fellowship, if, after the necessary explanations, it should be reciprocally regarded expedient, I distinctly informed you that my views of communion essentially accorded with those of Robert Hall. I directly told you that I did not regard it morally wrong—that is sinful—to commune with other evangelical Christians—those whom we, in good faith, regarded as the people of God. But I also remarked that I was acquainted with your views of communion, and if I united with you, I should, of course, in my public official character, expect to conform to them; while it was distinctly understood that I was to be at liberty to retain my own views on that subject.

You will not deny that these were the conditions on which I was received, accompanied with the expression of a hope, on your part, that my sentiments might ultimately accord with yours.

It has at length become my painful but imperative duty to inform you that this hope has not been realized, and that the experience of two years has only confirmed me more strongly in the correctness of my views on the subject under consideration.

I should regard it quite uncalled for, on any ordinary occasion, to inform you that on the subject of baptism there is the most cordial agreement between us. But as there are some who appear determined at all events to deny that those *are* Baptists who dare to disagree with them on the subject of communion; and as I wish to guard against all possible misconception of my views, I regard it necessary here to state that I am in good faith a Baptist. I sincerely believe that the immersion of a believer, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, is the only standing and inspired law of baptism in the Christian church, and that every departure from this is a corruption of the ordinance. But on this subject I need not dwell, as my published views are before you.

But I repeat, that my sentiments on communion are essentially with Robert Hall's. I regard it the privilege and duty of Christians to unite in those things in which they are agreed. As there is but one opinion among them with regard to the validity of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and their duty to observe it, I believe that they should meet together on this common ground. Nay, more—I believe that it is clearly and repeatedly the revealed will of their Lord and Master that they should not separate at the communion table—at that very point where, above all others, I think, he designed they should exhibit to the world their love to Him, and their love to each other.

It is not my intention in this communication to enter upon a defence of my views; and of course you will not, on the present occasion, expect from me any thing in the form of argumentation. I wish simply to

apprize you of my real sentiments; to inform you and the world where I stand; and it is my wish and determination, by this full and frank disclosure, to free myself from that officious interference on this subject, with which I have for some time past been annoyed.

In making this declaration of my sentiments, I beg you to believe that I have endeavored to act with the most serious and prayerful deliberation. On this subject, I assure you, I have no pride of opinion to gratify. I make no claims to infallibility or superior discernment. Nor do I wish to assume the attitude of a dictator to others, or a censurer of those who may differ from me in opinion. Leaving other men to the dictates of their own conscience on this subject, to commune with other denominations or not, as they may choose, I claim the same right for myself, and permit me to add, that I shall regard all attempts to contravene this right, so far as I am concerned, as a violation of the rights of conscience, and the laws of Jesus Christ; and of course shall feel bound in conscience, at every hazard, to resist them. With me, I assure you, the subject under consideration is not a mere point of indifferent speculation, but a matter of conscience. A matter which I regard intimately connected with my own peace of mind, my fidelity to Jesus Christ, and the welfare and peace and harmony of that church which he has purchased with his own blood. These being my real sentiments before God, and in view of the judgment, you are well aware that there is but one course for me to pursue—and that is, "to obey God rather than men."—Place yourself in my condition—that is, with my sentiments on this subject—and you will in a moment perceive that you would not act differently without proving a traitor to Jesus Christ.

My views, dear brethren, are now before you. If, with these views, and this distinct avowal of them, you can consistently continue to me your Christian fellowship, I have no wish to withdraw from your communion. But if you cannot consistently do this, a separation, you perceive, is inevitable. And I will only add, with respect to the course which you may regard it proper to pursue, in view of this communication, I have but one wish to express on the subject, and that is, that you may be influenced to act as you will wish you had acted, when each one of us shall stand before our common Lord.

Your Brother,  
In the bonds of the gospel,  
E. HALPING.  
Brandon, July, 1836.

It may not be known to all our readers that the foregoing writer was for some years a preacher, and for ought that appears in regular standing, among the Congregationalists. Some two or three years since, while examining Robert Hall's writings on communion, he embraced that author's sentiments. He was so well pleased with Hall's treatment of this subject that he was induced to examine his arguments in favor of baptism. His examination readily resulted in conviction—he came out, was baptized, united with the Baptist church in Bridport, and subsequently with the Addison County Baptist Ministerial Conference, since which time he has been preaching in different Baptist churches in this region. It now appears that since reading Robert Hall he has disagreed, on the subject of communion, both with Baptists and with Pedo-Baptists; for we believe that the latter in general hold that baptism should necessarily precede the Lord's Supper; but Hall's views, as adopted by brother Halping, are, that baptism is not a necessary prerequisite to communion.

These public communications are given at the urgent request of the writer, and on his responsibility for the course pursued, especially in relation to his address to the Ministerial Conference, which we think had better have been communicated in a less public manner. As to his explanation to the public, something of the kind was due to himself and to the denomination, and it is to be regretted that it has not appeared sooner. We cannot agree with brother Halping in attaching no blame to brother Haff. If the above statements be correct he is to be blamed. There is deception, whether it was intended or not. For proof that there is, we appeal to every reader of the pamphlet unacquainted with the circumstances, and ask whether the "Remarks on Communion" were not received as the sentiments of the writer of the sermon, whose name stands on the face of the pamphlet?

Our brother says that it "is not his intention in this communication to enter upon a defence of his views"—he only wishes to make known to the world his real sentiments—and inasmuch as he has avowed no Scripture "in the form of argumentation," it is not necessary here to enter upon a defence of opposite views—it is only needful to state distinctly that by us opposite views are entertained.

He has however said, "I believe that it is clearly and repeatedly the revealed will of their Lord and Master, that they should not separate at the communion table, at that very point where above all others, I think, he designed they should exhibit

their love to him and their love to each other." Over against this allow us to say, we believe that it is clearly and repeatedly the revealed will of their Lord and Master that they should not separate at the baptismal font—at that very point where, above all others, we think, he designed they should exhibit their obedience to him, as well as their love; for "if ye love me," says he, "keep my commandments." And what are the commandments? One is, "Believe and be baptized"—but stop, stop, we have almost involuntarily got to quoting Scripture, which was not done on the other side, and so may be left for the present on this. Let our Pedo-Baptist brethren, whose terms of communion are the same as ours, viz. baptism first and afterwards communion, join us in the former, and there will be no separation between them and us in the latter. For such a consummation we devoutly pray, with open arms extended towards them. In the light of their own views of communion as well as of ours, it will be seen that the point of separation between them and us is farther back than brother Halping has placed it. The only question to be settled between them and us is, what is baptism? The moment there is agreement on this point, the two are one. Now they agree with us that the immersion of a believer is baptism. We do not agree with them that any thing less than this is baptism. Of course while the views of the two remain as they are, they must perceive that the point of separation is where we just placed it. We repeat then, union at that point is union throughout. And what is needed to effect such a union? It will at once be seen by all, that, with our present views, for us to go over to them would be on our part a wicked sacrifice of principle, because we religiously believe that nothing less than the immersion of a believer is baptism, and that baptism is a necessary prerequisite to communion.

On the other hand, with their present views, for them to come to us would involve no sacrifice of principle, because they agree with us that our baptism is baptism, and also that baptism is a necessary prerequisite to communion. All then that separates us is, on their part a feeling of repugnance to what they acknowledge to be baptism. Will our Pedo-Baptist brethren join us in praying for the light that shall discover to us the will of the Lord and our duty in the matter between us?

These latter remarks however digressive they may be viewed to be by any, are offered as a vindication against any censure that may be harbored against us by brother Halping or others, in view of his expressed sentiments relative to the duty of the two to unite at the communion table.

Anticipated "attempts to contravene" or violate his "rights of conscience," are strange creatures of his imagination. They certainly have never had existence among Baptists, in connexion with the subject under consideration. Our brother's language is difficult of interpretation. Perhaps he expects to be labored with for error. What then? Suppose that a member of the Conference should be deputed to labor with him in the spirit of the gospel, with a view to convince him that he is in error. Would this necessarily involve an infringement of his rights of opinion or of conscience. Certainly not. Or suppose that he, being more faithful in the cause of his Master than they, convinced that they are in an error, should set out first with his Bible in hand, and commence the labor himself to convince them. This certainly would be no violation or contravention of their rights of conscience. Should his labor result in failure to convince them of what he supposed to be their error, and he should thereupon withdraw fellowship from them, saying, "how can two walk together except they be agreed?" still there is no violation of the rights of conscience. And so vice versa. It is difficult to conceive of any violation of the rights of conscience without coercion; and it is ridiculous to suppose that any coercion will be attempted in the case. What then our brother means by "resistance at every hazard," we do not understand. Is it that he is so fixed in his present opinions that he will remain incorrigible in spite of argument? We do not know. But what does it mean? We do not undertake to put any construction upon it, being willing, yea desirous that all should view it in the most favorable light. If the man's views are clear and correct on the point now under consideration, at least he is unhappy in his choice of language to communicate them. It strikes us however as

being more probable that his views are entirely incorrect as to what is, and what is not, a violation of the rights of conscience. We leave the subject here for the present, not doubting that our brethren of the Conference will make the case a subject of much prayer and earnest seeking after the mind of "our common Lord."

"HE JUDGED THE CAUSE OF THE POOR AND NEEDY; then it was well with him: WAS NOT THIS TO KNOW ME? saith the Lord."  
Jeremiah xxii: 16.

If there be one lesson taught in the Bible which stands out prominently beyond others, it is, that God abhors and will punish oppression, robbery, extortion, and every manner of violence done to the helpless poor. If there be one part of God's charge to his ministers, that is emphatic, reiterated and imperative above the rest, it is that which makes it their duty to preach repentance to those who add to other sins the above enumerated enormities—whether the sinners be individuals or nations. Witness the overthrow of Babylon, Egypt and Tyre. Listen to God's command to those whom he has appointed to declare his will: "Cry aloud—lift up thy voice like a trumpet." What shall they cry? "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work." "Execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." "Behold, the hire of the laborers which have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." "Therefore thus saith the Lord: Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor: behold I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine."

And yet, it seems, there are those in these latter days calling themselves, and wishing to be called preachers of that gospel which was by its Author preached to the poor as well as the rich, who would have us disregard the sighs and crying of naked, crushed and starving souls, and give ourselves wholly to the work of preaching the gospel!—of saving souls! If we "consider the poor"—if we say to Pharaoh, "let the people go"—if a rite of our time, energy and influence is given to paving the way to preaching the gospel to millions of American heathen, these faithful ones are thundering in our ears that Paul would have us "know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified!"—But the Lord says to "judge the cause of the poor and needy" is to "know him."—Who are these that take it upon themselves to give their own interpretation of the Scriptures, regardless of the mind of the Lord? We may preach temperance and peace, if we will say nothing about purity and righteousness. Allow us here to inquire whether this same Paul who knew nothing save Jesus and him crucified, did not on a certain occasion "reason of RIGHTEOUSNESS"? How strangely blind guides will pervert the Scriptures.

These introductory remarks are already protracted beyond our original design, but there is one more point which presses here. The text at hand is this:

"If any man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

Such is the unqualified language of the Apostle whom Jesus loved. We commend it to the prayerful attention of those who cry, strengthen the wall of prejudice, even in the church, between brother and brother, because God has made the two to differ in the complexion of their skin. Let my brother in the Lord drive my coach—let him cook my victuals and wait at my table—let him prepare the bread for the Lord's Supper—but let him never presume that he is worthy to eat with me or my children, either at my table or the Lord's! These are they who are looking and praying for the millennium! And what ideas must such entertain of the millennium? What do they expect to do when they meet their despised, hated, outcast brethren in heaven? What extravagant vanity—what presumptuous arrogance, to suppose that our Heavenly Father looks with peculiar complacency on a white complexion, when he has given it to less than a third part of the human race!

These thoughts have been suggested by a perusal of the following article from the pen of BERTHA GREEN, which ap-

pears in the last number of the Quarterly Anti-Slavery Magazine. It has also been received in a separate pamphlet, entitled,

## THE RELATION OF THE PULPIT TO SLAVERY.

## LETTER TO A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

To the Rev. —

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER,—I rejoice to hear you say, that in my views and feelings on the system of American slavery, you agree with me. In your mind, it is clear and certain, that it is a system of rebellion against God—involving fraud, adultery, and murder, the violation of every tie which binds man to man, and earth to Heaven. This system, you declare, ought immediately to be broken to pieces, and scattered on the winds. But with these declarations on your lips, you censure me for exposing in the pulpit its various deadly tendencies, and for urging on the hearts of all who heard me, the claims of the enslaved upon their sympathy and assistance. You tried to give point and effect to your censure by repeating in my ears the declaration of the Apostle Paul: "I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." You exhorted me as a preacher of the gospel, to imitate the Apostle to the Gentiles, and give myself up exclusively to the salvation of souls.

I do not feel myself at liberty to disregard either your censure or exhortation. With you, I bow reverently and gratefully to the authority of the Bible. If, in the matter before us, you are sustained by that authority, it is mine promptly, cheerfully, and fully to obey you, as the messenger of Heaven. But I am greatly a stranger to your character, if you can blame me for examining the basis of your appeal, before I yield to its intended influence. Nay, I feel assured that you will join with me in endeavoring clearly and certainly to ascertain the meaning of the Apostolic declaration, which you wish me to heed.

You understand the Apostle to confine his attention, as a Christian teacher, to a very small circle of topics; comprehending only the more commanding doctrines of the gospel. Among these, you suppose that the divinity of Christ, and the atonement by his blood, claimed a place peculiarly prominent. From these he never allowed himself so widely to depart, as to introduce to the church subjects so far removed from the vitals of Christianity, as the evils of servitude and the claims of the slave. You blame me for not imitating the example of the Apostle, and excluding from the lessons of instruction I may give, the doctrines of abolitionism. But after making the declaration, which you quote, did the Apostle exclude such topics from his discourses? In answering this question, so manifestly fair and appropriate, you will eagerly embrace such conclusions as the Epistle itself, which contains the declaration in question, forces on our convictions. Read the Epistle, my brother, and see over what a large field the Apostle allows himself to expatiate! What a variety of objects catch his attention, and employ his powers! In one place he forces on your boisterous eye the incest of a member of the Corinthian church, and the shameful neglect of his brethren to subject him to Christian discipline; in another, he points out to you the limits within which you may have intercourse with flagrant sinners. Here he exposes and condemns the conduct of such Christians as had lawsuits before heathen courts; and there he enters freely upon the discussion of the subject of marriage. With one breath he disposes of the difficulties which might embarrass his Christian brethren, when invited to partake of food which had been "offered in sacrifice to idols;" and the next, he employs in the asserting the claims of the Christian teacher to a competent support; and the third, in enforcing upon females the importance of their appearing veiled in religious assemblies. Nor does he overlook the condition and the duties of those who were under the bonds of servitude. He points them to the basis of freedom, to which the gospel had raised them. But I need not swell the list of topics, to which in one connection and another he directed the attention of his readers. It is very certain, that by the declaration to which you refer, the Apostle did not intend to exclude from his discourses such things as you blame me for discussing. What, then, did he mean? A fair question, which is entitled to an appropriate answer.

Permit me, my brother, to remind you, that when the Epistles to the Corinthian church were written, "excellency of speech and of wisdom" were generally thought to consist in the subtleties of a hair-splitting philosophy, and in artificial rhetoric. Such acquisitions, in a city like Corinth, remarkable for its wealth and luxury, would naturally be held in high estimation. What multiplied hints have we in the epistles, with which we are now more especially concerned, that for the Corinthian church such glittering baubles had strong attractions! Apollo, educated as he had been at Alexandria, seems as the head of a party, to have been preferred to Paul on account of the charms of his rhetoric. With these thoughts in your mind, mark what the Apostle disclaimed, in opposition to the course he pursued, as described in the declaration which we are now to dispose of. "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God." What did he then? "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified." What ever distinguished the Gospel from systems of human philosophy and heathenish superstition, the Apostle here presents under the description of Jesus Christ and

Him crucified. In the first place, then, I understand him to affirm, that in what he did, he acted in subservience to the progress of the Gospel. He had not aimed at Corinth to distinguish himself as a philosopher or rhetorician. He had not exerted himself to accumulate gold or brighten his reputation. Secular designs he had none to promote. A higher object engrossed his powers. To build up the church of Christ, and thus subvert the sole end of his solicitude and toil. To nothing, which had a bearing, near or remote, adverse or friendly on such an end, could he be indifferent. Even the veil for a woman's face became here a matter of deep interest—too important to be overlooked in a pastoral letter.

I understand the Apostle to affirm, in the second place, that he was anxious to present, and illustrate, and enforce every lesson of instruction he might give, in the light of the peculiarities of the Gospel. On whatever subject he might dwell, he did not choose to speak as an economist, or politician, or philosopher. A higher character he sustained. The various relations of those with whom he had to do, he contemplated in a more solemn light. To his eye, the truths of the Gospel shed their lustre on every thing. And what his eye saw, his tongue and pen could not but choose to describe. Whatever he might exhibit, he was "determined" to hold up in the light which shone from the face of the crucified Savior. Was he constrained to expose the guilt of the church, in allowing a gross fornicator to keep his place at the communion table? Who, taking his position at the foot of the cross, could adequately estimate that guilt? What motives to "purge out the old leaven" pressed upon their inmost spirits, when they remembered that "Christ their passover was sacrificed for them"? Would the Apostle dissuade his brethren from such intercourse with idolaters, as might be the occasion of apostasy to weaker members of the church? With what resistless force must his tender appeal have reached their hearts, when he acknowledged them, that through their "knowledge of the weak brother" might "perish, to whom Christ died!" Would he persuade "servants" to maintain their allegiance to their Savior, whatever opposition they might meet with from their masters? How appropriate and powerful is the argument he urges.—"Ye are bought with a price; BE NOT YE THE SERVANTS OF MEN." Thus, whatever truth he might be called to present, he was determined to present it as a Christian minister, testifying himself to Jesus Christ and Him crucified for arguments and illustrations.

Will you say, my brother, that I have lost sight of the example of the Apostle, either in introducing or disposing of the subject of slavery in my religious discourses? You cannot say so. Have I dwelt upon it as an economist, or politician, or philosopher? Have I sought applause as a rhetorician? Have I courted popularity for money or a name? No. Had I been guilty in any of these respects, I should have escaped the odium and reproach which, with no very sparing hand, have been measured out for me. No; it was because on the subject of slavery "I determined not to know any thing save Jesus Christ and him crucified," that I have been reviled and slandered. I have presented the slave as a brother—the child of our common Father; redeemed by our Savior, and entitled to all the benefits suited to such high relations. This is "the head and front of my offending." What if I were to gather a congregation of southern slaves around me, and expound and enforce for their benefit the direction of Paul, "Ye are bought with a price—be not ye the servants of men!" should I not preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified?

You remind me, that it is my appropriate business, as a preacher of the gospel, to toil for the salvation of souls. Your admonition I receive with humility and gratitude. Be it my privilege while I live, thus to labor. But may I pause, and dwell upon the meaning of your language? In what must the salvation of souls consist? In such fears, and hopes, and joys, as however they may agitate us, fail to reduce us to our proper places in the moral system, to which we belong? Then were the Scribes and Pharisees saved; for they seem to have had no lack of such feelings. Does it consist in maintaining, without reproach, a profession of religion, or inactivity in such enterprises, as have the patronage of the church, with which we may be connected? Then were the wretches saved, who the Savior declares devoured widows' houses, and for a pretence made long prayers! They were full of missionary zeal—"compassing sea and land to make a proselyte." To be saved, we must come into conformity with the relations we sustain to God and our neighbor. Short of this we may have our fears, and hopes, and joys, cut religious professions and enterprises—Short of this, we may make high pretensions, long prayers, and many proselytes. Short of this, we may employ with wonderful success a thousand so-called soul-saving expedients. But short of this, we cannot be saved. Short of this, what could we do in that world of eternal harmony, where every thing finds and keeps its proper place? The deacons of widows' houses here, must receive damnation hereafter. Alas! what then must become of those who make widows, and then DEVOUR THEM AND THEIR CHILDREN in the midst of the American churches? What must become of their apologists, however ingenious and grave they may be? What, my brother! have you a system of soul-saving, which inspires men with the hope of Heaven, while they refuse heartily to own every human creature as a brother? A system of piety, which leaves men below the level of humanity!